UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,532	06/26/2007	Georg Binder	016906-0543	2988
22428 7590 02/04/2011 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			EXAMINER	
SUITE 500	T NIXI	CIRIC, LJILJANA V		
3000 K STREE WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3785	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/591,532	BINDER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric	3785		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONEE	l. ely filed he mailing date of this communication.) (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 No. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn fro 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 September 2006 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	re: a) accepted or b) object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/01/2006; 02/20/2008; 07/14/2010.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te		

Application/Control Number: 10/591,532 Page 2

Art Unit: 3785

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of the seventh species (readable on claims 1 and 3 through 23) in the reply filed on November 12, 2010 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. Claim 2 is hereby withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to the non-elected second species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on November 12, 2010.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on September 1, 2006 are objected to because of uneven shading and line quality. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be

Art Unit: 3785

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not avoid phrases which can be implied (i.e., "The invention relates to") and also because it does not avoid legal phraseology (i.e., "comprising"). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

6. Claim 23 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

As written, claim 23 appears to depend from base claim 1, but fails to limit the same in any way.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 8. Claims 1 and 3 through 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and contain grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, "further direction" should be replaced with "additional direction" in claim 1, while "further branching structures" in claim 8 should be "additional branching structures".

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the

Application/Control Number: 10/591,532 Page 4

Art Unit: 3785

explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Wu, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of Ex parte Steigewald, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); Ex parte Hall, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and Ex parte Hasche, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 5 recites the broad recitation "formed from at least two parts", and the claim also recites "in particular two half-shells", which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation. Claims 11, 12, 13, 17, and 19 are similarly rendered indefinite.

Also, at least claims 4, 10, 15, 16, 19, and 22 have plural alternative limitations recited therein, which also render indefinite the metes and bounds of protection sought by the claims and by all claims depending therefrom.

9. Claim 23 provides for the use of the component of claim 1, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example Ex parte Dunki, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 5

11. As best can be understood in view of the indefiniteness of the claims, claims 1 and 3 through 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neuss et al. (U.S. Patent No.6,422,633 B2).

Neuss et al. discloses a modular vehicular air conditioning console essentially as claimed.

The reference thus reads on the claims.

Conclusion

12. The additional prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric whose telephone number is 571-272-4909. The examiner works a flexible schedule, but can normally be reached weekdays between 10:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy J. Swann can be reached on 571-272-7075. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Application/Control Number: 10/591,532 Page 6

Art Unit: 3785

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ljiljana (Lil) V. Ciric/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3785